

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SC 9990)  
United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)  
Chief, Criminal Division

SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)  
Assistant United States Attorney

150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900  
San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone: (408) 535-5056  
FAX: (408) 535-5066  
Susan.Knight@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ARIEL ARELLANO DIAZ,  
a/k/a ANTONIO JUAN GOMEZ,

Defendant.

No. 07-70225 PVT

STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~  
ORDER CONTINUING PRELIMINARY  
HEARING OR ARRAIGNMENT DATE  
AND EXCLUDING TIME

SAN JOSE VENUE

The undersigned parties respectfully request that the preliminary hearing or arraignment in the above-referenced case be continued from June 28, 2007 to August 2, 2007 at 1:30 p.m. before the Honorable Judge Lloyd. The reason for the continuance is that Miguel Hernandez, who represents the defendant, needs additional time to investigate the case and consider a pre-indictment resolution that the government has offered him. In addition, the parties request an exclusion of time under Rule 5 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and the Speedy Trial Act from June 28, 2007 to August 2, 2007. The parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of counsel.

1 SO STIPULATED:

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS  
United States Attorney

2  
3 DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

/s/  
SUSAN KNIGHT  
Assistant United States Attorney

5 DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

/s/  
MIGUEL A. HERNANDEZ  
Counsel for the defendant

8 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the preliminary hearing or arraignment is  
9 continued to August 2, 2007 at 1:30 p.m. before the Honorable Judge Lloyd. Good cause  
10 is shown and the continuance is proper under Rule 5 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure  
11 and 18 U.S.C. § 3060.

12 For good cause shown, the Court FURTHER ORDERS that time be excluded under the  
13 Speedy Trial Act from June 28, 2007 to August 2, 2007. The Court finds, based on the  
14 aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance  
15 outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant  
16 the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective  
17 preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage  
18 of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18  
19 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

20 SO ORDERED.

21  
22 DATED: 6/22/07

  
PATRICIA V. TRUMBULL  
United States Magistrate Judge